

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,542	11/21/2003	Sung-Su Jung	8734.257.00 US	7958
30827 7590 07/11/2007 MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP			EXAMINER	
1900 K STREE	ET, NW		TADESSE, YEWEBDAR T	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1734	
•	·			
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		07/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/717,542	JUNG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner .	Art Unit				
	Yewebdar T. Tadesse	1734				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 Ap	oril 2007.					
<u> </u>	action is non-final.	· .				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-20 is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	n from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/an Applicant may not request that any objection to the consequence of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	re: a) \square accepted or b) \square object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
AMa-ab		•				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	nte				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/04;2/07;3/07&3/28/07.	5) Notice of Informal P	atent Application				

Application/Control Number: 10/717,542

Art Unit: 1734

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Applicant's election without traverse of group I in the reply filed on 04/30/2007 is acknowledged.
- 2. Claims 15-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR
- 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 04/30/2007.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of

Art Unit: 1734

copending Application No.10/825,206 in view of JP 2002-258299. Application '206 discloses a dispenser comprising a plurality of syringes and a plurality of supports (at least one support or at least one dispenser unit) aligning the plurality of syringes. Application '206 lacks teaching a table and a substrate as claimed. JP' 299 discloses a dispenser for a liquid crystal comprising a substrate and a table on which the substrate is loaded. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a table and a substrate in '206 to manufacture a liquid crystal display panel.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Application/Control Number: 10/717,542

Art Unit: 1734

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted art (see Applicants' Fig 3 and pages 7-8 of specification).

With respect to claim 1, Admitted art discloses (see Applicants' Fig 3 and pages 7-8 of specification) a dispenser comprising a substrate (313A-313F), a table (310) on which the substrate is loaded; a plurality of syringes (301A-301C) and a support (314) aligning and affixing the plurality of syringes. Yet, admitted art lacks teaching a plurality of supports wherein at least a first predetermined number of syringes is affixed to at least one of the plurality of supports. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of supports in the admitted art, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

As to claim 5, in the admitted art the table is moved in forward/backward and left/right directions (see Fig 3 for the arrows).

Regarding claims 2-4 and 6-14, the claimed limitations are intended use of the apparatus related to the substrate and the coating material. These limitations do not add structure to the claimed apparatus.

Art Unit: 1734

8. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2002-258299.

With respect to claim 1, JP'299 discloses (see Fig 1 and English translated detained Description) a dispenser comprising a substrate (3), a table (stage 1) on which the substrate is loaded, a plurality of syringes (8) and a support (9) aligning and affixing the plurality of syringes. However, admitted art lacks teaching a plurality of supports wherein at least a first predetermined number of syringes is affixed to at least one of the plurality of supports. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of supports in the admitted art, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

As to claim 5, in the admitted art the table is moved in forward/backward and left/right directions (see paragraph 21).

Regarding claims 2-4 and 6-14, the claimed limitations are intended use of the apparatus related to the substrate and the coating material. These limitations do not add structure to the claimed apparatus. In any event, JP' discloses (see paragraphs 1-9) the type of substrate the seal pattern and coating material capable of including Silver.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yewebdar T. Tadesse whose telephone number is (571) 272-1238. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

Art Unit: 1734

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tucker Phillip can be reached on (571) 272-1095. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

YTT